

BOSNIA AMENDMENT

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I would like to comment briefly on one of the amendments that will be considered this morning, an amendment by Senator CRAIG of Idaho.

Senator CRAIG is an outstanding Member of this body and one of my closest friends, but I reluctantly will oppose the amendment he offered. I think he knows that I opposed the President's decision to deploy U.S. Armed Forces to Bosnia in 1995. I continue to have major problems with the situation there and questions about what the end game is. But I don't look at Bosnia in a theoretical sense only or without considering the history of that part of the world.

I have traveled to Brussels to meet with all of our NATO allies and discuss the situation in Bosnia. I spent the last 4th of July in Bosnia, Sarajevo, and Tuzla. I have looked at the situation firsthand. I spent many hours with administration officials and outside experts discussing the situation in Bosnia. I have grave concerns about the administration's completely open-ended commitment to remain in Bosnia. We were solemnly given dates and unequivocal assurances that U.S. troops would be out by December 1996. They weren't. Then it was July 1998. The President intends not to meet that date. The assurances we were given were wrong.

The fact that the administration has been so often wrong raises questions about their overall policy. Do we want peace there? Yes. Have we been willing to make a commitment? Yes. But the question is, How much, how long, and for what? Is the situation under control there? What is happening in Kosovo? Did the administration turn a blind eye and ignore that problem and only now realize the ramifications, the implications, that Kosovo has in the region?

There has been some progress in Bosnia. Many time lines and the agreements that were supposed to have been met, however, have not been met. We do need to continue to move forward and to encourage peace, democracy and freedom—not fighting and killing—in that part of the world.

But the U.S. taxpayers have already spent some \$8 billion in Bosnia since December of 1995. Our European allies have been reluctant to shoulder more of the burden. There are even credible reports that a French military officer tipped off the most notorious war criminal and helped him avoid apprehension. Basically, they say, You are the world leader; without you, it won't be done. We assume a very serious responsibility and maybe a certain degree of pride in that. But I think more needs to be done by our European allies and there needs to be a plan, some way of dealing with this problem, just like there should be a long-term plan in dealing with Saddam Hussein. There is no plan there, no plan to find a way to remove Saddam Hussein so the people in Iraq can be free.

The pattern begins to be clear. I have been very careful as majority leader to try to rise above politics or partisan politics. I have taken a pounding from some sources for that. I did support the Chemical Weapons Treaty and I do support NATO. But there is a limit to how far I will go. I will not support the administration unconditionally—particularly if there is no policy, no clear plan. I think that is the case in Iraq, where the policy of containment is not working. So what is next? Quite frankly, it falls to the Congress to try to say: How about this? Would you consider that? Develop a plan to do something, anything. We are prepared to do that if we have to because of the absence of action by the Administration.

For all those reasons, I am concerned about the administration's policy in Bosnia. This issue should be addressed by the Senate on merits later on this year in the appropriations process. But we should not use it as a way to delay the decision to enlarge NATO.

NATO enlargement is the right thing to do. But it should rise and fall on its own merits. We should not allow it to tangle up our decision into issues like Bosnia. I agree with Senator CRAIG's concerns, but I don't think this is the place to have the debate or action based on what may or may not be the future in Bosnia to determine what would happen in NATO. We should not make the legitimate aspirations of Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic subject to our differences with the executive branch on Bosnia policy. I hope the Senate will defeat this amendment and move to conclusion and pass NATO enlargement.

I yield the floor, Mr. President.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

PROTOCOLS TO THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY OF 1949 ON ACCESSION OF POLAND, HUNGARY, AND THE CZECH REPUBLIC

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now go into executive session and resume consideration of Executive Calendar No. 16, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Treaty Document No. 105-36, Protocols to the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949 on the Accession of Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic.

Pending:

Craig amendment No. 2316, to condition United States ratification of the protocols on specific statutory authorization for the continued deployment of United States Armed Forces in Bosnia and Herzegovina as part of the NATO mission.

Ashcroft amendment No. 2318, to require a Presidential certification that NATO is and will remain a defensive military alliance.

Conrad/Bingaman amendment No. 2320, to express the sense of the Senate regarding discussions with Russia on tactical nuclear weapons, increased transparency about tactical nuclear weapons, data exchange, increased warhead security, and facilitation of weapons dismantlement.

EXECUTIVE AMENDMENT NO. 2316

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of the Craig amendment, No. 2316, with the time until 12 noon to be equally divided.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, yesterday I put before the Senate a very straightforward amendment to our resolution of ratification that speaks to the responsibility of the President as it relates to getting authorization for the continued mission of our U.S. military in Bosnia. I say that in the context of us debating NATO expansion because I think it is appropriate. It is appropriate because of the way this President has characterized the need to expand NATO from his perspective. He speaks about it no longer as just a defense mechanism for Europe; he speaks of it as a mechanism for the purpose of peacekeeping.

We have heard several of our colleagues come to the floor in the last good number of days as we have debated this issue, frustrated by what will be the role of a new NATO, and how should we define that—at least from our understanding—as we move for the purpose of ratification, upholding our constitutional responsibilities, which are paramount on this issue.

I am one of those Senators who has said very openly that I don't believe we ought to be expanding NATO at this time. We ought to be encouraging the European Community to reach out to those nations that have now emerged from behind the fallen Iron Curtain—reach out to them in an economic way, bringing them into the economic union, creating greater economic stability rather than, if you will, offering them the olive branch of inclusion into NATO as some coming of age process, and turning to the United States and, in essence, saying, now you have to pay for it or you have to play a greater role—especially when I don't think any of us sense the dramatic urgency of an expanded defensive mission for the whole of a freer Europe. That strength would come through the economic growth of those countries and the greater strength of their democracies because of the economic growth. Some of us have also expressed concern about, of course, Russia and how it feels as we tend to expand a defensive peacekeeping mechanism toward them, and not being willing to focus as much as we should on assisting, ensuring the democratic processes in Russia itself.

As a result of that, I think it is tremendously important that we cause this administration to define what its intent is. As you know, Mr. President, we are now in a period of time in Bosnia where we are operating without authorization from Congress. Costs are mounting in a tremendous way, and as